UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,956	10/31/2003	Martin Scholz	16104-014001 / 2003P00684	8804

32864   7590   11/17/2008
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
DUNN, DARRIN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/17/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/698,956	SCHOLZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DARRIN DUNN	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 August 2008</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　　　2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
　　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is responsive to the communication filed on 08/27/08.

2.   Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

       1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
       2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
       3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
       4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness
               or nonobviousness.

5.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coker et al.

(USPN 2007/0250840) in view over Lee et al. (USPN 20040088700).

6.   As per claims 1 and 10, Coker et al. teaches which code (i) is configured to be stored on

the client device and be executed during each of subsequent communications between the client

device and the server device ([0307-0309] e.g., client includes a component called a busy state

manager configured to monitor and inform a user of a status and progress of the submitted

request), and (ii) when executed blocks the client device from receiving user input during the

communications between the client device and the server device ([0309] e.g., client can inform

the user that request processing has started and lock the user interface), determines whether any

of the communications between the client device and the server device lasts longer than a

specific time, and, upon determining that the specific time has been exceeded, causes a message

provided in the code to be presented to a user of the client device ([0309-0310] e.g., upon

determining that the request from the client may take a long time to process, the server will

notify the client accordingly....the client can update the progress bar to show how much of the

task has been completed at that point in time.

However, Coker et al. does not teach the server providing executable code to the client

computer, i.e., providing the busy-state manager component to a client computer). Lee et al.

teaches a system for automatically installing software on a client via a server ([ABSTRACT],

[FIG 1])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have

motivation to install client components using software stored on a server. Lee et al. teaches that

enterprises employ client-server models to facilitate the configuration of a client computer via

downloading necessary application software ([0004-0006]). Coker et al. teaches that various

types of clients can be supported....the various types of clients including remote clients ([0063]),

and in addition, teaches that clients can download a subset of server's data to use locally

([0070]). Therefore, in client-server interactions, as taught by Lee et al. it would have been

obvious to enable a server to provide necessary components to remote clients to facilitate server-

client interactions, including downloading necessary components to a client. Here, it would have

been obvious to download a busy-state manager component to a remote client via an application

server.

7.   As per claim 2, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the executable code is

client-side framework code provided from the framework code in the server device that controls

communication between the server device and the client device ([0306-0310] e.g., busy state

manager component is stored on the client, i.e. client side framework, provided from the

framework code in the server device (e.g., as modified, an application server provides the busy

state component to the client), where the framework code controls communication between the

client and server, i.e., client is informed by the server communication will last longer than

expected, and in response, the client user interface is locked. Controlling communication is

interpreted as corresponding to informing the client device of a process status)

8.   As per claim 3, Lee et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising providing the

executable code in response to the server device receiving a request from the client device to

launch an application program capable of initiating the communications ([0011] e.g.,

automatically installing software on a client via a client login request. As interpreted, a login

request is an application program that initiates the request for the executable code. As applied to

Coker et al., the busy-state component could be downloaded in response to the client request for

the component by following the steps provided in paragraph 0011)

9.   As per claim 4, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 3, further comprising providing

an application program code to the client device wherein the message is an over-definition of a

default message ([0309] e.g., updating a progress bar is interpreted as providing an over-

definition of a default message because an update to a progress bar would be indicative of new text, i.e., over definition)

10.   As per claim 5, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein a communication lasts longer than the specific time due to network delays, server-side delays, or combinations thereof ([0309] e.g., request ling-running server operations i.e., server-side delays)

11.   As per claim 6, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein a communication lasts longer than the specific time when the client device has not displayed a server response within the specific time ([0309-0314] e.g., once the client is informed by the server that the request may take a long time to process in view of the requests from a client, it would have been obvious to provide an indication that the client request is taking longer than expected, i.e., not displaying a server response, to the client request)

12.   As per claim 7, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the executable code ceases to block the client device from receiving user input after each communication has ended ([0310] e.g., client continues to lock the interface until the request processing is completed)

13.   As per claim 8, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the executable code causes the message to be presented on the client device during one of the communication and causes the client device to cease presenting the message after that communication has ended ([0310] e.g., as best understood, the busy manager causes the notification to be presented to the user and causes the client to cease presenting the message when the request processing is completed)

14.   As per claim 9, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising setting the specific time based on at least one selected from the group consisting of: a roundtrip time for a

communication between the server device and the client device, typical roundtrip times for

communication between the server device and the client device, a roundtrip time expected by at

least one user of the client device, and combinations thereof ([0314] e.g., roundtrip to the server,

including the request from the client to the server and a response notification to the server, in

view of [0310] e.g., determining the request is taking longer than expected, is interpreted that

determining a request may take a long time to process is a function of a round trip, i.e., request

from a client to server and response notification)

15.   As per claim 11, Coker et al., as modified, teaches a method of informing a user about

communications between a client device and a server device, the method comprising:

   storing the executable code on the client device, the executable code configured to be

executed during each of subsequent communications between the client device and the server

device ([0306-0310] e.g., busy-manager component);

   blocking, per the executable code, the client device from receiving user input during its

communications with a server device ([0309-0310]);

   determining whether any of the communications lasts longer than a specific time; and

presenting, per the executable code, a message provided in the code to a user of the client device

upon determining that any of the communications lasts longer than the specific time ([0310] e.g.

server notifies client that the request may take a long time to finish)

       However, Coker et al. does not teach the server providing executable code to the client

computer, i.e., providing the busy-state manager component to a client computer). Lee et al.

teaches a system for automatically installing software on a client via a server ([ABSTRACT],

[FIG 1])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to install client components using software stored on a server. Lee et al. teaches that enterprises employ client-server models to facilitate the configuration of a client computer via downloading necessary application software ([0004-0006]). Coker et al. teaches that various types of clients can be supported....the various types of clients including remote clients ([0063]), and in addition, teaches that clients can download a subset of server's data to use locally ([0070]). Therefore, in client-server interactions, as taught by Lee et al. it would have been obvious to enable a server to provide necessary components to remote clients to facilitate server-client interactions, including downloading necessary components to a client. Here, it would have been obvious to download a busy-state manager component to a remote client via an application server.

16.   As per claim 12, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 11, wherein the presented message is an over-definition of a default message ([0309] e.g., updating a progress bar is interpreted as providing an over-definition of a default message because an update to a progress bar would be indicative of new text, i.e., over definition)

17.   As per claim 13, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 11, further comprising setting the specific time based on at least one selected from the group consisting of: a roundtrip time for a communication between the server device and the client device, typical roundtrip times for communication between the server device and the client device, a roundtrip time expected by at least one user of the client device, and combinations thereof ([0314] e.g., roundtrip to the server, including the request from the client to the server and a response notification to the server, in view of [0310] e.g., determining the request is taking longer than expected, is interpreted that

determining a request may take a long time to process is a function of a round trip, i.e., request

from a client to server and response notification)

18.   As per claim 14, Coker et al. teaches a computer program product containing executable

instructions that when executed cause a processor to perform operations comprising:

    block a client device from receiving user input during its communications with a server

device ([0309] e.g., locking user interface);

     determine whether any of the communications lasts longer than a specific time; and

cause a message provided in the code to be presented to a user of the client device if determining

that any of the communications lasts longer than the specific time ([0309-0310]);

19.   As per claim 15, Coker et al. teaches a computer system comprising:

(Currently amended) A computer system comprising:

    a server device with server-side framework code which when executed on the server device

establishes a client-server framework for client-server communications ([Fig 2], [Fig 13] e.g.,

client-server communications with executable code),; and

    code (i) is configured to be stored on the client device and be executed during each of

subsequent communications between the client device and the server device ([0307-0309] e.g.,

client includes a component called a busy state manager configured to monitor and inform a user

of a status and progress of the submitted request), and (ii) when executed blocks the client device

from receiving user input during the communications between the client device and the server

device ([0309] e.g., client can inform the user that request processing has started and lock the

user interface), determines whether any of the communications between the client device and the

server device lasts longer than a specific time, and, upon determining that the specific time has

been exceeded, causes a message provided in the code to be presented to a user of the client

device ([0309-0310] e.g., upon determining that the request from the client may take a long time

to process, the server will notify the client accordingly....the client can update the progress bar to

show how much of the task has been completed at that point in time.

However, Coker et al. does not teach the server providing executable code to the client

computer, i.e., providing the busy-state manager component to a client computer). Lee et al.

teaches a system for automatically installing software on a client via a server ([ABSTRACT],

[FIG 1])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have

motivation to install client components using software stored on a server. Lee et al. teaches that

enterprises employ client-server models to facilitate the configuration of a client computer via

downloading necessary application software ([0004-0006]). Coker et al. teaches that various

types of clients can be supported....the various types of clients including remote clients ([0063]),

and in addition, teaches that clients can download a subset of server's data to use locally

([0070]). Therefore, in client-server interactions, as taught by Lee et al. it would have been

obvious to enable a server to provide necessary components to remote clients to facilitate server-

client interactions, including downloading necessary components to a client. Here, it would have

been obvious to download a busy-state manager component to a remote client via an application

server.

20.   As per claim 16, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 15, wherein a communication

lasts longer than the specific time due to network delays, server-side delays, or combinations

thereof ([0309] e.g., request ling-running server operations i.e., server-side delays)

21.   As per claim 17, Coker et al. teaches the method of claim 15, wherein the presented

message is an over-definition of a default message ([0309] e.g., updating a progress bar is

interpreted as providing an over-definition of a default message because an update to a progress

bar would be indicative of new text, i.e., over definition)

22.   As per claim 18, Coker et al. teaches the computer system of claim 15, wherein the

client-side framework code causes the message to be displayed on the client device ([0306-0310]

e.g., busy state manager)

23.   As per claim 19, Coker et al. teaches the computer system of claim 15, wherein the

specific time is based on at least one selected from the group consisting of: typical roundtrip

times for communication between the server device and the client device, a roundtrip time

expected by at least one user of the client device, and combinations thereof ([0314] e.g.,

roundtrip to the server, including the request from the client to the server and a response

notification to the server, in view of [0310] e.g., determining the request is taking longer than

expected, is interpreted that determining a request may take a long time to process is a function

of a round trip, i.e., request from a client to server and response notification)

24.   As per claim 20, Coker et al. teaches the computer system of claim 15, wherein at least

one roundtrip time for communication between the server device and the client device is

recorded and the specific time is set based on the at least one roundtrip time ([0314] e.g., in light

of 0309-0310, a determination is made that a request will take longer than expected. The

roundtrip, i.e., request to client and notification from server to client, is understood as being part

of the determination that a request received from a client may take a long time to process. Thus,

the determination would require that the roundtrip time be known, and if this time (request by

client and server response) is going to take longer than expected, a message would be presented

to the user)

Conclusion

25.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

6460058 – progress bar notification messages

6901051 – performance metrics, i.e., roundtrip calculation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to DARRIN DUNN whose telephone number is (571)270-1645.

The examiner can normally be reached on EST:M-R(8:00-5:00) 9/5/4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DD   /Albert DeCady/
11/07/08   Supervisory Patent Examiner
                                                            Art Unit 2121